

A Note on $(0,2)$ Models on Calabi-Yau Complete Intersections

Mahmoud Nikbakht-Tehrani [†]

Institut für Theoretische Physik, Technische Universität Wien
Wiedner Hauptstraße 8–10, A-1040 Wien, AUSTRIA

Abstract

In the class of $(0,2)$ heterotic compactifications which has been constructed in the framework of gauged linear sigma models the Calabi-Yau varieties X are realized as complete intersections of hypersurfaces in toric varieties $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ and the corresponding gauge bundles (or more generally gauge sheaves) $\mathcal{E}$ are defined by some short exact sequences. We show that there is yet another degree of freedom in resolving singularities in such models which is related to the possible choices of nef partitions of the anticanonical divisors in Gorenstein Fano toric varieties $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$.

February 1998

[†]e-mail: nikbakht@tph16.tuwien.ac.at

1 Introduction

The gauged linear sigma model (GLSM) approach to the construction of $(0, 2)$ heterotic string vacua [1] has enabled a rather explicit study of the moduli space of this class of string vacua. This is mainly due to the connection of this approach with the more accessible methods of toric geometry [2]. Apart from the fact that the study of $(0, 2)$ string vacua is per se of great interest, it is also desirable in other respects such as the duality between heterotic strings and F-theory compactifications [3, 4]. Recent years have witnessed some exciting progress in our understanding of the structure of the space of string vacua in which such dualities play an important role.

As a naive phase analysis of $(0, 2)$ linear sigma models shows, in the geometrical phase the resulting Calabi-Yau varieties are generally singular, signaling that this naive phase picture is not complete. Therefore, we are led to resolve these singularities. The issue of resolving singularities in $(0, 2)$ models has some peculiarities which are not shared by their better understood $(2, 2)$ relatives. A physically sensible procedure for resolving singularities in $(0, 2)$ models has been proposed in [5]. A more sophisticated analysis of some issues arising in this connection can be found in the recent works [4, 6].

Our purpose in this letter is to show that for $(0, 2)$ models whose target spaces are complete intersection Calabi-Yaus in a toric variety $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ the choice of a nef partition represents yet another degree of freedom which should also be taken into consideration.

The organization of this work is as follows. In the next section we quickly review those aspects of GLSMs that we will need later. Section 3 provides the necessary mathematical background from toric geometry. In section 4 we bring an example which explicitly demonstrates the role of nef partitions in the desingularization process. We conclude with some comments about open problems.

2 The gauged linear sigma models

In this section we briefly explain the basic ideas behind the GLSM approach without going into details. We will do this using a typical situation which we are interested in (cf. [1, 5] for more details).

The starting point is a $(0, 2)$ supersymmetric $U(1)$ gauge theory that represents a nonconformal member of the universality class of a $(0, 2)$ superconformal field theory. The action S which describes such a model is $S = S_{\text{gauge}} + S_{\text{matter}} + S_W + S_{D,\theta}$, where

S_{gauge} , S_{matter} are the kinetic terms of the gauge and matter fields, respectively, S_w is the superpotential and $S_{D,\theta}$ is the Fayet-Iliopoulos D -term and the θ -angle term. Let $P, \Phi_1, \dots, \Phi_6$ be chiral scalar superfields with $U(1)$ charges $-m, w_1, \dots, w_6$, and let $\Gamma^1, \Gamma^2, \Lambda^1, \dots, \Lambda^5$ be chiral spinor superfields with $U(1)$ charges $-d_1, -d_2, q_1, \dots, q_5$ such that $m = \sum_a q_a$ and $\sum_j d_j = \sum_i w_i$. The superpotential is given by

$$S_w = \int d^2z d\theta^+ (\Gamma^j W_j(\Phi_i) + P \Lambda^a F_a(\Phi_i)) + h.c., \quad (1)$$

where W_j and F_a are homogeneous polynomials in Φ_i of degrees d_j and $m - q_a$, respectively. It is assumed that the W_j 's are transversal polynomials and that the F_a 's do not vanish simultaneously on $W_1(\phi_i) = W_2(\phi_i) = 0$. Integrating out the auxiliary D field in the gauge multiplet and the auxiliary fields in the chiral spinor superfields, we get the scalar potential

$$U = \sum_j |W_j(\phi_i)|^2 + |p|^2 \sum_a |F_a(\phi_i)|^2 + \frac{e^2}{2} \left(\sum_i w_i |\phi_i|^2 - m |p|^2 - r \right)^2,$$

where the parameter r is the coefficient in the Fayet-Iliopoulos D -term and ϕ_i, p denote the lowest terms of the superfields Φ_i and P , respectively. Now varying the parameter r this model exhibits different 'phases'. By minimizing the scalar potential U for large positive values of r we obtain

$$\sum_i w_i |\phi_i|^2 = r, \quad W_1(\phi_i) = W_2(\phi_i) = 0, \quad p = 0.$$

Taking the quotient by the action of the $U(1)$ gauge group these equations describe a complete intersection Calabi-Yau variety X as the zero locus of the homogeneous polynomials $W_j(\phi_i)$ in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(w_1, \dots, w_6)$ with the Kähler class proportional to r . The right-moving fermions ψ_i (the superpartners of ϕ_i) couple to the tangent bundle of X . The left-moving fermions λ^a (the lowest components of the spinor superfields Λ^a) couple to the vector bundle V defined by the following exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow \bigoplus_{a=1}^5 \mathcal{O}(q_a) \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{O}(m) \rightarrow 0. \quad (2)$$

So we find that our gauged linear sigma model for large positive values of r reduces in the infrared limit to a $(0, 2)$ Calabi-Yau σ model with the target space X being a complete intersection of hypersurfaces in the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(w_1, \dots, w_6)$, and with a rank 4 gauge bundle V defined by (2). These geometric data still have to satisfy the following condition that comes from cancellation of the $U(1)$ gauge anomaly. This leads to the quadratic Diophantine equation:

$$m^2 - \sum_a q_a^2 = \sum_j d_j^2 - \sum_i w_i^2.$$

It should be noted that the complete intersection Calabi-Yau varieties in weighted projective spaces are in general singular ¹.

In the process of desingularization we have to handle two sets of data. At first we have to resolve the singularities of the base variety X . In the toric geometrical setting the starting point is a reflexive polytope Δ in a rank five lattice $\mathbf{N}$. This polytope defines a toric variety $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ which is generally a blowup of the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(w_1, \dots, w_6)$. By taking a maximal triangulation of Δ we arrive at a Calabi-Yau phase of the underlying model. Note that a maximal triangulation of Δ amounts above all to adding new one-dimensional cones to $\Sigma^{(1)}$ (= the set of one-dimensional cones in Σ) which are associated with the points on the faces of Δ ². In the context of gauged linear sigma models these correspond to additional chiral scalar superfields and additional $U(1)$ factors in the gauge group. We also need to determine the charges of the fields with respect to the full gauge group. Translated into the geometric language this means that we have to determine the degrees of the variables in the homogeneous coordinate ring S . Let x_i and D_{e_i} denote the variables in the homogeneous coordinate ring S [7] and the divisors associated to e_i (= the primitive lattice vector on $\rho_i \in \Sigma^{(1)}$), respectively. The calculation of the cokernel of the map

$$\alpha : \mathbf{M} \longrightarrow \bigoplus_i \mathbb{Z} \cdot D_{e_i}, \quad m \mapsto \sum_i \langle m, e_i \rangle D_{e_i},$$

where $\mathbf{M} = \text{Hom}(\mathbf{N}, \mathbb{Z})$ is the dual lattice, yields the desired quantities. Note that the desingularization of the base variety simultaneously resolves the tangent sheaf to which the right-handed fermions couple. Therefore, these fermions have the same charges as their superpartners. We still have to deal with the gauge bundle. Following [5] we take the solutions of the following system of Diophantine equations

$$m^{(k)} = \sum_a q_a^{(k)} \quad , \quad m^{(k)} m^{(\ell)} - \sum_a q_a^{(k)} q_a^{(\ell)} = \sum_j d_j^{(k)} d_j^{(\ell)} - \sum_i w_i^{(k)} w_i^{(\ell)} \quad (3)$$

with $\sum_j d_j^{(k)} = \sum_i w_i^{(k)}$ as possible gauge bundle data for the desingularized theory³. As we will show in section 4, the system (3) depends in the case of complete intersection Calabi-Yau X on the choice of a nef partition of Δ .

¹We assume that the Calabi-Yau varieties that arise in this way have at worst canonical singularities. We recall that a (normal) variety X is said to have canonical singularities if mK_X is a Cartier divisor for some integer $m \geq 1$ and if $f : \tilde{X} \rightarrow X$ is a local resolution of singularities then $mK_{\tilde{X}} = f^*(mK_X) + \sum_j a_j E_j$, where K_X and $K_{\tilde{X}}$ are the canonical divisors of X and $\tilde{X}$, respectively, E_j are the exceptional prime divisors of f and a_j are nonnegative integers.

²This is a consequence of our assumption on the type of singularities of X .

³ $k, \ell = 1, \dots, \#U(1)$ factors.

3 Calabi–Yau complete intersections and nef partitions

Let $\mathbf{N}$ and $\mathbf{M} = \text{Hom}(\mathbf{N}, \mathbb{Z})$ denote a dual pair of lattices of rank d and Δ be a reflexive polytope in $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}} = \mathbf{N} \otimes_{\mathbb{Z}} \mathbb{R}$. Let $E = \{e_1, \dots, e_n\}$ be the set of vertices of Δ . Note that the e_i 's are primitive lattice vectors. Further, let $E = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_r$ be a partition of E and $D_i = \sum_{e_k \in E_i} D_{e_k}$, where D_{e_k} denotes the T -invariant Weil divisor associated to the one-dimensional cone⁴ $\rho_k = \langle e_k \rangle$. Recall that a divisor $D = \sum_j a_j D_{e_j}$ is a T -invariant Cartier divisor if and only if there exists a continuous real function ψ_D on $|\Sigma|$, the support of the fan Σ , with $\psi_D(e_j) = a_j$ such that

- ψ_D is integral, i.e. $\psi_D(|\Sigma| \cap \mathbf{N}) \subset \mathbb{Z}$,
- ψ_D is Σ -piecewise linear, i.e. the restriction of ψ_D to each cone in Σ is an $\mathbb{R}$ -linear function.

If ψ_D is convex, i.e. $\psi_D(t\mathbf{v} + (1-t)\mathbf{w}) \leq t\psi_D(\mathbf{v}) + (1-t)\psi_D(\mathbf{w})$ for all $\mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w} \in |\Sigma|$ and $t \in [0, 1]$, then D is semi-ample which means that $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}}(D)$ is generated by its global sections.

A nef partition of E is a partition $E = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_r$ such that its corresponding divisors D_i ($= \sum_{e_k \in E_i} D_{e_k}$) are semi-ample T -invariant Cartier divisors. This can be equivalently formulated as follows. Note that the anticanonical divisor $-K = \sum_{j=1}^n D_{e_j}$ of the toric variety $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}$ constructed from Δ is an ample Cartier divisor. Therefore, its corresponding function ψ is (strictly) convex. $E = E_1 \cup \dots \cup E_r$ is a nef partition of E if there exists Σ -piecewise linear integral convex functions ψ_i , $i = 1, \dots, r$, with $\psi_i(e_k) = 1$ for $e_k \in E_i$ and $\psi_i(e_k) = 0$ for $e_k \notin E_i$ such that $\psi = \psi_1 + \dots + \psi_r$.

A complete intersection Calabi-Yau variety with only canonical singularities can be realized in a Gorenstein Fano toric variety in the following way. Using the correspondence of reflexive polytopes and Gorenstein Fano toric varieties we begin first with a reflexive polytope Δ in $\mathbf{N}$ and construct its corresponding toric variety $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}$. Next we consider a nef partition of the anticanonical divisor $-K = \sum_{i=1}^r D_i$ of $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}$. Now let Y_i be a generic section of $\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}}(D_i)$. Then the complete intersection $\bigcap_{i=1}^r Y_i$ will be a canonical Calabi-Yau variety of codimension r in $\mathbb{P}_{\Sigma}$ [9, 10].

⁴It is the closed subvariety $X_{\text{cospan } \rho_k^{\vee}}$ in $X_{\rho_k^{\vee}}$ [8].

4 An example in detail

We begin with the superpotential (1) with

<i>field</i>	P	Φ_1	Φ_2	Φ_3	Φ_4	Φ_5	Φ_6	Γ^1	Γ^2	Λ^1	Λ^2	Λ^3	Λ^4	Λ^5
<i>charge</i>	-6	1	1	1	1	2	4	-6	-4	1	1	1	1	2

<i>poly.</i>	W_1	W_2	F_1	F_2	F_3	F_4	F_5
<i>deg.</i>	6	4	5	5	5	5	4

which reduces in its ‘Calabi-Yau phase’ to a $(0, 2)$ sigma model with target space X a codimension 2 complete intersection Calabi-Yau variety in $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$. The gauge bundle V is defined by the following short exact sequence

$$0 \rightarrow V \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(1)^{\oplus 4} \oplus \mathcal{O}(2) \xrightarrow{F} \mathcal{O}(6) \rightarrow 0. \quad (4)$$

The reflexive polytope Δ corresponding to $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} e_1 &= (1, 0, 0, 0, 0) & e_2 &= (0, 1, 0, 0, 0) & e_3 &= (0, 0, 1, 0, 0) & e_4 &= (0, 0, 0, 1, 0) \\ e_5 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, 1) & e_6 &= (0, 0, 0, 0, -1) & e_7 &= (-1, -1, -1, -2, -4). \end{aligned}$$

with respect to the canonical basis in the rank five lattice $\mathbf{N}$. It can be easily checked that there are no other points on the faces of Δ . Taking a maximal triangulation of the reflexive polytope Δ leads to a simplicial fan Σ whose big cones are defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_1 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_3 e_4 e_5 \rangle & \sigma_2 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_3 e_4 e_6 \rangle & \sigma_3 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_3 e_5 e_7 \rangle & \sigma_4 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_3 e_6 e_7 \rangle \\ \sigma_5 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_4 e_5 e_7 \rangle & \sigma_6 &= \langle e_1 e_2 e_4 e_6 e_7 \rangle & \sigma_7 &= \langle e_1 e_3 e_4 e_5 e_7 \rangle & \sigma_8 &= \langle e_1 e_3 e_4 e_6 e_7 \rangle \\ \sigma_9 &= \langle e_2 e_3 e_4 e_5 e_7 \rangle & \sigma_{10} &= \langle e_2 e_3 e_4 e_6 e_7 \rangle \end{aligned}$$

The Fano toric variety $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ constructed from the simplicial fan Σ is a blowup of the weighted projective space $\mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$. The one-dimensional cone $\langle e_6 \rangle$ corresponds to the resulting exceptional divisor. The variety $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$ still has a curve of $\mathbb{Z}_2$ -cyclic quotient singularities. Let x_i denote the variables in the homogeneous coordinate ring S which correspond to the bosonic fields of the model under consideration. The calculation of the cokernel of the map α in our case yields

<i>field</i>	x_1	x_2	x_3	x_4	x_5	x_6	x_7
<i>charge</i>	(1, 0)	(1, 0)	(1, 0)	(2, 0)	(4, 1)	(0, 1)	(1, 0)

The nef partitions

Let $X_1, \dots, X_5$ denote the coordinate functions on $\mathbf{N}_{\mathbb{R}}$ with respect to the canonical basis and $\varphi(X_1, \dots, X_5) = a_1X_1 + \dots + a_5X_5$ be a typical linear form on it. Each integer solution of the following systems of equations, in which $\varphi_i(e_j) \in \mathbb{Z}$, gives us a (T -invariant) Cartier divisor:

$\boxed{\sigma_1} \leftrightarrow \varphi_1 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_1(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_1(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_1(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_1(e_4) \\ a_5 &= \varphi_1(e_5) \end{aligned}$	$\boxed{\sigma_2} \leftrightarrow \varphi_2 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_2(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_2(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_2(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_2(e_4) \\ -a_5 &= \varphi_2(e_6) \end{aligned}$
$\boxed{\sigma_3} \leftrightarrow \varphi_3 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_3(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_3(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_3(e_3) \\ a_5 &= \varphi_3(e_5) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_3(e_7) \end{aligned}$	$\boxed{\sigma_4} \leftrightarrow \varphi_4 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_4(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_4(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_4(e_3) \\ -a_5 &= \varphi_4(e_6) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_4(e_7) \end{aligned}$
$\boxed{\sigma_5} \leftrightarrow \varphi_5 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_5(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_5(e_2) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_5(e_4) \\ a_5 &= \varphi_5(e_5) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_5(e_7) \end{aligned}$	$\boxed{\sigma_6} \leftrightarrow \varphi_6 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_6(e_1) \\ a_2 &= \varphi_6(e_2) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_6(e_4) \\ -a_5 &= \varphi_6(e_6) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_6(e_7) \end{aligned}$
$\boxed{\sigma_7} \leftrightarrow \varphi_7 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_7(e_1) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_7(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_7(e_4) \\ a_5 &= \varphi_7(e_5) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_7(e_7) \end{aligned}$	$\boxed{\sigma_8} \leftrightarrow \varphi_8 \quad \begin{aligned} a_1 &= \varphi_8(e_1) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_8(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_8(e_4) \\ -a_5 &= \varphi_8(e_6) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_8(e_7) \end{aligned}$
$\boxed{\sigma_9} \leftrightarrow \varphi_9 \quad \begin{aligned} a_2 &= \varphi_9(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_9(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_9(e_4) \\ a_5 &= \varphi_9(e_5) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_9(e_7) \end{aligned}$	$\boxed{\sigma_{10}} \leftrightarrow \varphi_{10} \quad \begin{aligned} a_2 &= \varphi_{10}(e_2) \\ a_3 &= \varphi_{10}(e_3) \\ a_4 &= \varphi_{10}(e_4) \\ -a_5 &= \varphi_{10}(e_6) \\ -a_1 - a_2 - a_3 - 2a_4 - 4a_5 &= \varphi_{10}(e_7) \end{aligned}$

[1] For the partition $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_6, e_7\} \cup \{e_5\}$ we see that the corresponding divisors D_1 and D_2 are indeed Cartier. Therefore, $D_1 = \sum_j \varphi_1(e_j) D_{e_j}$ with $\varphi_1(e_j) = 1$ for $e_j \in E_1$ and $\varphi_1(e_j) = 0$ otherwise, and $D_2 = \sum_j \varphi_2(e_j) D_{e_j}$ with $\varphi_2(e_j) = 0$ for $e_j \in E_1$ and $\varphi_2(e_j) = 1$ otherwise. The functions φ_1 and φ_2 are given by⁵

$\varphi_1(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4$	$\varphi_1(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_5$
$\varphi_2(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4 - X_5$	$\varphi_2(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$
$\varphi_3(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - 2X_4$	$\varphi_3(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -2X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_4(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_4(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$
$\varphi_5(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 - 5X_3 + X_4$	$\varphi_5(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -4X_3 + X_5$
$\varphi_6(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_4 - X_5$	$\varphi_6(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$
$\varphi_7(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 - 5X_2 + X_3 + X_4$	$\varphi_7(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -4X_2 + X_5$
$\varphi_8(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_3 + X_4 - X_5$	$\varphi_8(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$
$\varphi_9(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -5X_1 + X_2 + X_3 + X_4$	$\varphi_9(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -4X_1 + X_5$
$\varphi_{10}(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_2 + X_3 + X_4 - X_5$	$\varphi_{10}(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$

After some elementary but tedious calculations we find out that φ_1 and φ_2 are convex, which means that the above partition is nef⁶.

[2] For the partition $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_6, e_7\} \cup \{e_4, e_5\}$ we find that the corresponding divisors D_1 and D_2 are also Cartier. Therefore, $D_1 = \sum_j \varphi_1(e_j) D_{e_j}$ with $\varphi_1(e_j) = 1$ for $e_j \in E_1$ and $\varphi_1(e_j) = 0$ otherwise, and $D_2 = \sum_j \varphi_2(e_j) D_{e_j}$ with $\varphi_2(e_j) = 0$ for $e_j \in E_1$ and $\varphi_2(e_j) = 1$ otherwise. The functions φ_1 and φ_2 are given by

$\varphi_1(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3$	$\varphi_1(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_2(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_2(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_4$
$\varphi_3(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - 2X_4$	$\varphi_3(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -2X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_4(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_4(X_1, \dots, X_5) = 0$
$\varphi_5(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 - 3X_3$	$\varphi_5(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -6X_3 + X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_6(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_6(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -2X_3 + X_4$
$\varphi_7(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 - 3X_2 + X_3$	$\varphi_7(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -6X_2 + X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_8(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_8(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -2X_2 + X_4$
$\varphi_9(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -3X_1 + X_2 + X_3$	$\varphi_9(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -6X_1 + X_4 + X_5$
$\varphi_{10}(X_1, \dots, X_5) = X_1 + X_2 + X_3 - X_5$	$\varphi_{10}(X_1, \dots, X_5) = -2X_1 + X_4$

φ_1 and φ_2 are also convex. Therefore, the above partition is also nef⁷.

⁵ φ_i denotes the restriction of both φ_1 and φ_2 to the i -th big cone of Σ .

⁶This nef partition corresponds to a Calabi-Yau complete intersection of hypersurfaces of degrees $d_1 = (6, 0)$ and $d_2 = (4, 1)$, respectively.

⁷This nef partition corresponds to a Calabi-Yau complete intersection of hypersurfaces of degrees

The data of gauge bundle in the desingularized theory can be determined for the first nef partition from the following system of Diophantine equations (cf. (3))

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 + q_5 - p &= 0 \\ q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 + 2q_5 - 6p &= 0 \\ q_1^2 + q_2^2 + q_3^2 + q_4^2 + q_5^2 - p^2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

For the second partition the same data can be determined from the system

$$\begin{aligned} q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 + q_5 - p &= 0 \\ q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 + 2q_5 - 6p &= -2 \\ q_1^2 + q_2^2 + q_3^2 + q_4^2 + q_5^2 - p^2 &= 0. \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It can be easily seen that the trivial solution $q_1 = \dots = q_5 = p = 0$ is the only solution of (5) while the system (6) doesn't have any solution which means that the model whose target variety is defined by the second nef partition does not admit a desingularization!

The Euler characteristic

The nonsingular model [1]

The primitive collections of Σ are $\{e_5, e_6\}, \{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_7\}$. Taking the quotient of intersection ring $A^\bullet(\mathbb{P}_\Sigma)_\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}[x_1, \dots, x_8]/I + J$ of $\mathbb{P}_\Sigma$, where

$$I = \langle x_1 - x_7, x_2 - x_7, x_3 - x_7, x_4 - 2x_7, x_5 - x_6 - 4x_7 \rangle, \quad J = \langle x_5x_6, x_1x_2x_3x_4x_7 \rangle,$$

by the annihilator of $x_5 \cdot (x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_6 + x_7)$ we arrive at $A^\bullet(\tilde{X})_\mathbb{Q}$. The calculation of the third Chern class yields $c_3(\tilde{V}) = -68x_7^3$ in $A^\bullet(\tilde{X})_\mathbb{Q}$. Since $\langle D_1D_2D_3D_5D_7 \rangle = \langle D_1D_2D_3D_6D_7 \rangle = 1/2$ and $\langle D_iD_jD_kD_lD_m \rangle = 1$ for all other big cones we find by using the 'algebraic moving lemma' that the normalization in $A^\bullet(\tilde{X})_\mathbb{Q}$ is $\langle x_7^3 \rangle = 5/2$. Therefore, $\chi(\tilde{V}) = -85$.

The singular model [2]

Let $\mathfrak{Z}$ and $\mathfrak{Y}$ denote hypersurfaces of degrees 6 and 4, respectively, whose complete intersection defines the Calabi-Yau variety X in $\mathbb{P} := \mathbb{P}(1, 1, 1, 1, 2, 4)$ ⁸. Using

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P}(-6) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathbb{P} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{Z} \rightarrow 0, \\ 0 &\rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{Z}(-4) \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_\mathfrak{Z} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}_X \rightarrow 0, \end{aligned}$$

$\mathbf{d}_1 = (6, 1)$ and $\mathbf{d}_2 = (4, 0)$, respectively.

⁸ X is a well-formed complete intersection which allows us to use the adjunction formula [12].

and (4) together with their corresponding long exact cohomology sequences and taking into account that [11]

$$H^p(\mathbb{P}, \mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}}(q)) = \begin{cases} \bigoplus_{\substack{n_i \geq 0 \\ i=1, \dots, 6}} \mathbb{C} \cdot x_1^{n_1} \dots x_6^{n_6} \Big|_{deg. q} & \text{for } p = 0 \\ 0 & \text{for } 0 < p < 5 \\ \bigoplus_{\substack{n_i > 0 \\ i=1, \dots, 6}} \mathbb{C} \cdot x_1^{-n_1} \dots x_6^{-n_6} \Big|_{deg. q} & \text{for } p = 5 \end{cases}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{array}{c|c|c} h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1)) = 4 & h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(2)) = 11 & h^0(X, \mathcal{O}_X(6)) = 129 \\ \hline h^3(X, \mathcal{O}_X(1)) = 0 & h^3(X, \mathcal{O}_X(2)) = 0 & h^3(X, \mathcal{O}_X(6)) = 0 \end{array}$$

which yields the result⁹ $h^1(X, V) = 102$ and $h^i(X, V) = 0$ for $i \neq 1$. Therefore $\chi(V) = -102$.

5 Conclusion

We have seen that if the target space of a $(0, 2)$ model is a complete intersection Calabi-Yau variety, then there appears an additional degree of freedom in the desingularization process which is related to the possible choices of nef partitions of the defining reflexive polytope of the ambient toric variety. Obviously, the only use of the anomaly cancellation conditions and the above degree of freedom yields plenty of possible desingularized models in most cases. A question which can be immediately posed is which of these possible desingularizations are physically admissible vacua and how are they related. It is expected that the stability of gauge bundles imposes severe restrictions here, but not much about this is known. There is a second point which is worthwhile a moment of reflection. We have seen that in some cases there is no desingularization for a given $(0, 2)$ model although the base Calabi-Yau variety is not minimal, a fact which contrasts the $(2, 2)$ case, where the existence of a minimal Calabi-Yau variety is guaranteed. It would be interesting to know which physical consequences such an obstruction has.

Acknowledgement. I would like to thank M. Kreuzer for reading the manuscript and for useful comments. This work has been supported by the Austrian Research Fund

⁹Note that the stability of gauge bundle also implies $H^0(X, V) = H^3(X, V) = 0$!

(FWF) under grant Nr. P10641-PHY and ÖNB under grant Nr. 6632.

References

- [1] E. Witten, *Phases of $N=2$ theories in two dimensions*, Nucl. Phys. **B403** (1993) 159, [hep-th/9301042](#)
J. Distler, S. Kachru, *$(0,2)$ Landau-Ginzburg theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B413** (1994) 213, [hep-th/9309110](#)
J. Distler, *Notes on $(0,2)$ superconformal field theories*, Proceedings of the 1994 Trieste Summer School, [hep-th/9502012](#)
- [2] P.S. Aspinwall, B.R. Greene, D.R. Morrison, *Calabi-Yau moduli space, mirror manifolds and spacetime topology change in string theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B416** (1994) 414, [hep-th/9309097](#)
P.S. Aspinwall, B.R. Greene, *On the geometric interpretation of $N=2$ superconformal theories*, Nucl. Phys. **B437** (1995) 205, [hep-th/9409110](#)
- [3] R. Friedman, J. Morgan, E. Witten, *Vector bundles and F -theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. **187** (1997) 679, [hep-th/97011162](#)
M. Bershadsky, A. Johansen, T. Pantev, V. Sadov, *Four-dimensional compactifications of F -theory*, Nucl. Phys. **B505** (1997) 165, [hep-th/9701165](#)
R.Y. Donagi, *Principal bundles on elliptic fibrations*, Asian J. Math. Vol. 1 (June 1997) 214, [alg-geom/9702002](#)
- [4] M. Bershadsky, T.M. Chiang, B.R. Greene, A. Johansen, C.I. Lazaroiu, *F -Theory and linear sigma models*, [hep-th/9712023](#)
- [5] J. Distler, B.R. Green, D.R. Morrison, *Resolving singularities in $(0,2)$ models*, Nucl. Phys. **B481** (1996) 289, [hep-th/9605222](#)
- [6] T.-M. Chiang, J. Distler, B.R. Green, *Some features of $(0,2)$ moduli space*, Nucl. Phys. **B496** (1997) 590, [hep-th/9509170](#)
R. Blumenhagen, *Target space duality for $(0,2)$ compactifications*, [hep-th/9707198](#); R. Blumenhagen, *$(0,2)$ target space duality, CICYs and reflexive sheaves*, [hep-th/9710021](#)
E. Sharpe, *Extremal transitions in heterotic string theory*, [hep-th/9705210](#); E. Sharpe, *Notes on heterotic compactifications*, [hep-th/9710031](#)
- [7] D.A. Cox, *The homogeneous coordinate ring of a toric variety*, J. Algebr. Geom. 4 No.1 (1995) 17-50, [alg-geom/9210008](#)
- [8] V.I. Danilov, *The geometry of toric varieties*, Russian Math. Survey **33**, n.2 (1978) 97
W. Fulton, *Introduction to toric varieties*, Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, (1993)

- [9] L.A. Borisov, *Towards the mirror symmetry for Calabi-Yau complete intersections in Gorenstein toric Fano varieties*, [alg-geom/9310001](#)
- [10] V.V.Batyrev, L.A.Borisov, *Dual cones and mirror symmetry for generalized Calabi-Yau manifolds*, [alg-geom/9402002](#); V.V.Batyrev, L.A.Borisov, *On Calabi-Yau complete intersections in toric varieties*, [alg-geom/9412017](#)
D.A. Cox, *Recent developments in toric geometry*, [alg-geom/9606016](#)
- [11] I. Dolgachev, *Weighted projective varieties*, Lecture Notes in Math. **956** (1981) 34
M. Nikbakht-Tehrani, *On the cohomology of twisting sheaves on toric varieties*, [math.AG/9802018](#)
- [12] A.R. Fletcher, *Working with weighted complete intersections*, MPI/89-35